

Honduras - Public Financial Management and Public-Private Partnerships

Report generated on: February 22, 2018

Visit our data catalog at: <https://data.mcc.gov/evaluations/index.php>

Overview

Identification

COUNTRY

Honduras

EVALUATION TITLE

Public Financial Management and Public-Private Partnerships

EVALUATION TYPE

Independent Evaluation

ID NUMBER

DDI-MCC-HND-TCP-2017-v01

Version

VERSION DESCRIPTION

Edited clean data for internal use only

Overview

ABSTRACT

The Honduras Threshold Country Program (TCP) aims to increase the efficiency and transparency of public financial management (PFM) and public private partnerships (PPP) in Honduras. Given the disparate nature of TCP activities, the evaluation is in many ways a collection of several small evaluations rather than one comprehensive study. At its core, the various components of the evaluation comprise a longitudinal performance evaluation. The evaluation includes two surveys: a survey of vendors selling goods and services to the government of Honduras (GoH) and a survey of public employees in three government institutions. Baseline data was collected in 2016 and endline data collection is planned for 2018. The remainder of the evaluation is heavily qualitative, primarily involving detailed document reviews and interviews and group interviews with key informants. Qualitative baseline data collection occurred in early 2016, interim data collection in late 2017, and an endline is expected in 2019.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Pre-Post

UNITS OF ANALYSIS

Individuals (Public employees) & Firms (Vendors)

KIND OF DATA

Sample survey data [ssd]

TOPICS

Topic	Vocabulary	URI
Capacity Building and Institutional Development	MCC Sector	

KEYWORDS

Vendors, Public Employees, Honduras, Threshold, Finance

Coverage

GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE

National

UNIVERSE

Public Employees Survey

The study population consists of public employees of the government of Honduras at the technical level and above working at the three target institutions: the Secretariats of Health (SESAL), of Education (SEDUC), and of Infrastructure and Public Works (INSEP)

Vendor Survey

Vendors registered to sell goods and services to the government through the Regulatory Office of Contracting and Acquisitions (ONCAE)

Producers and Sponsors

PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR(S)

Name	Affiliation
Social Impact	

FUNDING

Name	Abbreviation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC	

Metadata Production

METADATA PRODUCED BY

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC		Review of Metadata
Social Impact	SI		Independent Evaluator

DATE OF METADATA PRODUCTION

2018-01-18

DDI DOCUMENT VERSION

Version 1 (January 2018)

DDI DOCUMENT ID

DDI-MCC-HND-TCP-2017-v01

MCC Compact and Program

COMPACT OR THRESHOLD

Threshold

PROGRAM

Public Financial Management (PFM) and Public-Private Partnerships (PPP)

MCC SECTOR

Capacity Building and Institutional Development (Cap Bldg & Inst Dev)

PROGRAM LOGIC

The Honduras TCP seeks to support the GoH in improving transparency and government efficiency in PFM through four activities: • Activity 1.1 Budget and Treasury Management involves technical assistance and training for the Ministry of Finance and line ministries to improve budget analysis and treasury management. It also entails technical assistance and training for the Congressional Budget Committee to improve congressional budget oversight capacity. • Activity 1.2 Improving Procurement Capacity, Planning, and Controls entails technical assistance to the Regulatory Office of Contracting and Acquisitions of Honduras (ONCAE) and other GoH entities to improve procurement. This activity also involves expanding ONCAE's online supply catalogue and improving coordination between ONCAE and the Supreme Audit Tribunal (TSC) to ensure that established procurement norms are properly audited for compliance. • Activity 1.3 Improving Capacity of the

TSC is designed to strengthen the capacity of the TSC in performance auditing. • Activity 1.4 Grant Facility for Social Accountability provides grants to Honduran civil society organizations (CSOs) to undertake social accountability projects that assess the quality of spending and service delivery in order to increase government accountability. The TCP also aims to improve transparency and government efficiency in PPPs through two sets of activities: • Activity 2.1 Develop Core PPP Capacity is designed to improve the capacity of and procedures utilized by GoH agencies with key PPP responsibilities to develop and implement PPPs in accordance with best practice. This activity includes support for the government institution responsible for structuring PPPs (COALIANZA), development of manuals and internal procedures, and support for the Finance Secretariat (SEFIN) in properly identifying and managing fiscal risks in its PPP portfolio.² • Activity 2.2 Design and Implementation of PPPs provides specialized technical assistance for the GoH to facilitate the administration of current PPPs and to identify and analyse options for structuring a new PPP. This activity focuses on the Secretariat of Infrastructure and Public Services (INSEP) as well as the NGO FIDE. In summary, the TCP involves diverse activities aimed at improving public financial management and public private partnerships with the larger goal of saving government money, improving service delivery, and reducing corruption. A more detailed overview of the program logic is available in Figure A of the Baseline Report.

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

While the scope of program participants in the threshold program is extensive, the public employees survey covered employees within three TCP-targeted institutions: the Infrastructure and Public Services Secretariat (INSEP), the Secretariat of Health (SESAL), and the Secretariat of Education (SEDUC).

Sampling

Study Population

Public Employees Survey The study population consists of public employees of the government of Honduras at the technical level and above working at the three target institutions: the Secretariats of Health (SESAL), of Education (SEDUC), and of Infrastructure and Public Works (INSEP) **Vendor Survey** Vendors registered to sell goods and services to the government through the Regulatory Office of Contracting and Acquisitions (ONCAE)

Sampling Procedure

Public Employees Survey

We used the Government of Honduras's public employees database (Sistema de Registro y Control de Empleados Públicos - SIREP) to create the sampling frame. For the Secretariats of health and education, we used a three-stage cluster sampling design. First, municipalities were selected proportionate to size; second, health or education facilities were selected proportionate to size; and third, within each selected cluster, eight public employees were randomly selected and surveyed. Limitations of the sampling frame (e.g., lack of numeric identifiers for schools and clinics) limited our ability to randomly select health and education facilities without first selecting municipalities. Within INSEP, a two-stage sampling approach was utilized, whereby INSEP offices were randomly selected proportionate to size and then employees in that facility were randomly selected.

Because perceptions and attitudes about the topics covered in the survey differ between administrators and technical staff (e.g., health care workers, teachers) and because administrators only accounted for seven percent of the sampling frame for education personnel, far less than in the other two institutions, an additional 150-administrator oversample was added to the SEDUC sample to ensure comparability across the three samples.

While the sample was intended to be representative of those at the "technical level" and above, as defined by Honduras's civil service regime, the SIREP database did not contain this civil service categorization. Instead, additional measures were needed to limit the sample to this population. We used salary as a proxy, and those earning less than 11,200 lempiras per month, the base salary for technical level staff, were dropped from the study. While a useful proxy to exclude some employees, there are many employees below the technical level who earn more than this amount because of tenure or other factors. Given that higher-level staff tends to be posted in more urban and larger facilities, we determined to use the number of public employees in a municipality and in a facility as a proxy. For health, municipalities with less than 15 health workers (the lower 50 percent of municipalities) and facilities with less than 16 (2x the cluster size of 8) were excluded from the sampling frame. With education, municipalities with less than 60 teachers (lower 50 percent of municipalities) and facilities with less than 16 (2x the cluster size of 8) were excluded from the sampling frame. While this could introduce a bias associated with location and facility, it increased the probability of reaching the intended population, allowed for a national sample, and greatly facilitated the administration of the survey. This issue was not a concern for INSEP, where the vast majority of its employees are based in Tegucigalpa.

Other exclusions included the following: (a) individuals who were obviously non-technical, based on their job title (e.g., security guard, driver); (b) individuals with extensive missing data, particularly location data (missing data was especially problematic in the case of SEDUC); (c) employees in Gracias a Dios and Islas de Bahia, who were fewer in number and dropped because of the expense in reaching these locations; and (d) part-time employees. In addition, (e) the survey also contained screening questions to filter out sampled individuals at the lower technical support level.

The final sample size was 1,719; 499 from the Infrastructure and Public Services Secretariat, 550 from the Secretariat of Health, and 670 from the Secretariat of Education.

For more information regarding representative confidence intervals for diverse sample proportions, please see Table 3.

Vendor Survey

Vendors were intended to be randomly selected from a registry of vendors to the government maintained by the Regulatory Office of Contracting and Acquisitions (ONCAE). Analysis of the registry identified 3,623 valid firms or consultants enrolled in the registry from which to sample. Originally a sample of 900 firms was drawn from this sampling frame with 900 replacements; however, due to incomplete and outdated information, the data collection firm was only able to achieve a contact rate 51.8%. As a result, of this low contact and a low cooperation rate (45.5%), interviews were sought with all firms that could be contacted.

Response Rate

Public Employees Survey

Outright refusals to participate were relatively low; the largest driver of the low response rate was difficulty in contacting sampled employees (a low contact rate). In fact, 703 employees in the sample were considered “absent” and could not be located in a timely fashion.

Vendor Survey

Due to incomplete and outdated data, out of 3,623 registered domestic vendors, only 1,876 were able to be contacted (51.8% contact rate). Ultimately, 853 participated in the survey (45.5% cooperation rate), yielding an ultimate response rate of 23.6%.

Weighting

Public Employee Survey results are unweighted.

Questionnaires

Overview

Public Employees Survey

The Public Employees Survey consists of a single questionnaire which attempts to capture perceptions, personal experiences, and attitudes on the key issues of procurement, hiring, promotions, corruption, and transparency. More specifically, the survey consisted of the following sections; job satisfaction, institution's service provision, general corruption, human resources, procurement, public-private partnerships, external organizations, respondent's professional information, and respondent's personal information.

Vendor Survey

The vendors survey consisted of a single questionnaire. The survey is comprised of the following sections: business information, general procurement experience, targeted-institution-specific procurement experience, procurement experience with other government institutions, comparison of experience across agencies, procurement challenges, ONCAE and the Association for a More Just Society (ASJ), company information, and personal information.

Data Collection

Data Collection Dates

Start	End	Cycle
2016-03-31	2016-10-17	Baseline (PES)
2016-06-20	2016-11-30	Baseline (VS)

Data Collection Notes

Public Employees Survey

Thirty two enumerators and six supervisor candidates completed training between February 22 and February 25, 2016.

Health Secretariat pilot testing was conducted with 29 respondents on February 26. Education Secretariat pilot testing was conducted with 30 respondents on March 16-17, 2016. Finally, Infrastructure and Public Services Secretariat pilot testing was conducted with 19 respondents on June 16, 2016.

Vendor Survey

Baseline data collection occurred over 21 weeks from June 20 to November 30, 2016. After the data collection firm contacted and coordinated with selected vendors, a single enumerator conducted a face-to-face interview, typically at the respondents' office or a public location. In cases where firms were located remotely, interviews were conducted over the phone. There was one supervisor for every three enumerators. The supervisor would randomly select an enumerator to accompany and provide oversight. The number of enumerators and supervisors varied throughout data collection. Initially, nine enumerators and three supervisors conducted fieldwork. As the number of arranged interviews dropped towards the end of data collection only three enumerators and one supervisor completed data collection.

Questionnaires

Public Employees Survey

The Public Employees Survey consists of a single questionnaire which attempts to capture perceptions, personal experiences, and attitudes on the key issues of procurement, hiring, promotions, corruption, and transparency. More specifically, the survey consisted of the following sections; job satisfaction, institution's service provision, general corruption, human resources, procurement, public-private partnerships, external organizations, respondent's professional information, and respondent's personal information.

Vendor Survey

The vendors survey consisted of a single questionnaire. The survey is comprised of the following sections: business information, general procurement experience, targeted-institution-specific procurement experience, procurement experience with other government institutions, comparison of experience across agencies, procurement challenges, ONCAE and the Association for a More Just Society (ASJ), company information, and personal information.

Data Collectors

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation
ESA Consultores		Public Employees Survey
Espirállica		Vendor Survey

Supervision

Public Employees Survey

Five groups, each consisting of one group leader, one receptionist and two enumerators, carried out data collection between March 31 and October 17, 2016. The group leader was responsible for coordinating the surveys in each institution and liaising with the head of the institution's human resources department. The receptionist was responsible for making the first contact with the selected persons, verifying the employees' ID cards and assigning an enumerator to obtain informed consent prior to the interview. Enumerators read the informed consent and obtained approval for the interview. To encourage honest responses, respondents were given the option to self-administer the survey on the tablet. For

self-administered surveys, enumerators trained the respondent in tablet use and accompanied the person during the interview process provide technical support and answer any questions. In face-to-face interviews, enumerators administered the survey and recorded responses using the tablets.

Irma Romero, Social Impact's in-country coordinator, conducted field supervision visits to ensure protocol compliance.

Vendor Survey

Interviews were conducted by a single enumerator. Supervisors randomly selected an enumerator to accompany and observe. There was a single supervisor for every three enumerators.

Data Processing

Other Processing

Data entry occurred concurrently with data collection through SurveyCTO. The survey instrument was programmed using Open Data Kit and administered via tablets.

Data Appraisal

Estimates of Sampling Error

Vendor Survey

Sample proportions of 10%, 25%, and 50% would have respective margins of error of 2.0%, 2.9%, and 3.4%. Institution-specific sample size calculations are presented in Table 4 of the Baseline Report.